

**Draft Environmental Assessment
Title Transfer of a Federally-Owned
Water Distribution System to the
Montecito Water District**

**United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation
South-Central California Area Office
1243 N Street
Fresno, California 93721-1813
(559) 487-5127**

August 28, 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROJECT NEED STATEMENT	1
1.1 Proposed Project	1
1.2 Purpose and Need Statement	1
2.0 PRIMARY BENEFICIARIES AND RELATED ACTIVITIES.....	1
3.0 PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT AREA	2
4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	5
4.1 Air Quality	6
4.2 Water Quality/Flooding	7
4.3 Public Facilities/Solid Waste Management	9
4.4 Land Use	10
4.5 Transportation/Circulation	11
4.6 Natural Environment	12
4.7 Environmental Justice and Human Population	14
4.8 Construction	15
4.9 Energy Impacts	15
4.10 Noise Abatement and Control	16
4.11 Explosive Flammable Operations	17
4.12 Toxic, Chemical, and Radioactive Materials	18
4.13 Geologic Processes	19
4.14 Cultural Resources - Archaeological and Historic Resources	20
4.15 Ethnic Resources	22
4.16 Fire Protection	23
4.17 Recreation	24
4.18 Aesthetic/Visual Resources	25
4.19 Housing	26
5.0 INFORMATION SOURCES	27
5.1 Agencies and Individuals Consulted	27
5.2 Bibliography	27

5.3	Other Sources	27
6.0	PROJECT SPECIFIC AND CUMULATIVE IMPACT SUMMARY	27
7.0	PROJECT ALTERNATIVES	28
7.1	No Action Alternative	28
7.2	Partial Ownership Transfer	28
8.0	COMPLIANCE WITH THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT:.....	28
9.0	COMPLIANCE WITH THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT	29
10.0	COMPLIANCE WITH THE FISH AND WILDLIFE COORDINATION ACT.....	29
11.0	COMPLIANCE WITH THE INDIAN TRUST ASSETS	30
12.0	COMPLIANCE WITH THE STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT.....	30

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

13.0	MITIGATION MEASURES	30
14.0	LIST OF PREPARERS	30

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page	
Figure 1	Service Distribution System	3

Appendix

California Department of Fish and Game Natural Diversity Data Base
Search Results for the Carpinteria Quad

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

TITLE TRANSFER OF A FEDERALLY-OWNED WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM TO THE MONTECITO WATER DISTRICT

1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROJECT NEED STATEMENT

1.1 PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project is a transfer of ownership of an existing water distribution system from the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (Bureau) to the Montecito Water District (MWD). This service infrastructure is already located within MWD boundaries and is currently operated and maintained by the MWD. The Bureau-owned distribution system includes 2-10⁷ diameter pipelines and appurtenant infrastructure (e.g., valves, end drains, etc.), located throughout the Summerland area within the MWD's current boundaries and the Asegra Pumping Plant (see Figure 1). There are just under six miles of functioning pipelines and less than one mile of abandoned pipeline comprising the system. The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of the distribution system and does not include any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure. The transfer includes rights-of-way, easements, and fences appurtenant to the distribution system. In addition, one parcel that is currently owned by the Bureau is also being proposed for transfer to the District. This parcel is the site of the Asegra Pumping Plant. The Assessor's Parcel Number is (APN) 005-0-002 and its size is less than one acre. This parcel is located in the northeastern quadrant of the system to be transferred.

1.2 PURPOSE AND NEED STATEMENT

The purpose of the proposed project is to simplify the operation and maintenance of the service distribution system by reducing unnecessary paperwork and consultation between the Bureau and MWD. The National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) requires the full disclosure of the environmental impacts, alternatives, potential mitigation, and environmental compliance procedures of federal actions. This Environmental Assessment has been prepared to provide NEPA compliance.

2.0 PRIMARY BENEFICIARIES AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

The primary beneficiaries of the proposed project are the MWD and the Bureau. The MWD will benefit by reducing costs, time, and paperwork associated with consultation with the Bureau, regarding operation and maintenance of the service distribution system. The Bureau will also benefit by reducing costs, time, and paperwork associated with overseeing the operation and maintenance of the service distribution system and by eliminating the requirement of inspecting the system once every three years.

In order for the proposed project described herein to be implemented, the NEPA process must be completed, and the project approved by both the Bureau and MWD. Additionally, the U.S. Congress will need to authorize approval of the project.

3.0 PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT AREA

The Montecito County Water District was incorporated on November 10, 1921 and later changed its name to "Montecito Water District" pursuant to Section 31006 of the Water Code. The District was formed for the purposes of furnishing potable water within the District.

The MWD was enlarged on December 6, 1995, when the Summerland Water District was formally dissolved and merged with the MWD. At the November 7, 1995 election, the voters of the Summerland Water District approved the dissolution of the Summerland District and the reorganization for the MWD to assume the assets, obligations and responsibility for water service in the Summerland area. The project infrastructure is located within the community of Summerland and was included in the reorganization effort.

The District is located in the southern coastal portion of Santa Barbara County and as indicated above, includes the unincorporated communities of Montecito and Summerland. It has a population of approximately 13,100 and currently provides water to over 4,300 customers. Figure 1 shows the regional location of the District and project infrastructure.

The District currently obtains its water supplies from the following:

c. Cachuma Project Water from the United States (Cachuma)	50%
c. Jameson Lake, Fox and Alder Creeks and Doulton Tunnel	45%
c. Local groundwater basin	3%
c. State Water Project	2%

The MWD encompasses an area of 9,874 acres, of which approximately 6,883 acres are developed (about 98 % as residential and 2% as commercial) and approximately 1,021 acres are currently used for agriculture. The District terrain is relatively steep, varying in elevation from sea level to 1,000 feet. The system is gravity-fed with a series of pressure zones controlled by pressure regulating stations, with water pumped from the South Coast conduit and from wells.

The community of Summerland is located on a flat, narrow coastal terrace and can be described as a small, rural beach town. It is bordered by the shoreline of the Santa Barbara Channel to the south and the steeply rising Santa Ynez Mountains to the north. Highway 101 and the Union Pacific Rail Road pass through the area, which is located between the Cities of Carpinteria to the east and Santa Barbara to the west.

Figure 1 ? Service distribution system

Intentionally blank page behind 11 x 17 figure

Site Information	
Land Use Designation	The Summerland area consists of many land uses ranging from residential, commercial, agriculture and industrial.
Zoning District, Ordinance	The Summerland area consists of many land uses zones ranging from residential, commercial, agriculture and industrial.
Service Area	MWD serves approximately an area totaling 9,874 acres.
Surrounding Uses/Zoning	<i>North:</i> Santa Ynez Mountains <i>South:</i> Pacific Ocean <i>East:</i> Open space with City of Carpinteria beyond <i>West:</i> Montecito with City of Santa Barbara beyond
Sensitive Areas	Romero Creek to the west, coastal bluffs and pristine coastland to the south.
Annual precipitation and seasonal weather patterns.	Mediterranean climate characterized by warm, dry summers and cooler, relatively damp winters. Precipitation averages between 10-18 inches/year.
Access	General access to the project area is provided by U.S. 101.
Public Services	<i>Water Supply:</i> Montecito Water District <i>Sewage:</i> Summerland County Sanitation District <i>Fire:</i> Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District <i>Police:</i> Santa Barbara County Sheriff Department

C 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The following checklist indicates the potential level of impact and is abbreviated as follows:

- I. Known Signif.: Known significant environmental impacts.
- II. Unknown Poten. Signif.: Unknown potentially significant impacts which need further review to determine significance level.
- III. Poten. Signif. and Mitig.: Potentially significant impacts which can be mitigated to less than significant levels.
- IV. Not Signif.: Impacts which are not considered significant.
- V. No Impact: No impacts will result.

C 4.1 AIR QUALITY:

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
a. The violation of any ambient air quality standard, a substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation including, CO hotspots, or exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (emissions from direct, indirect, mobile and stationary sources)?					X
b. Is the project located within an "attainment" or "non-attainment" area? If in a "non-attainment area, does the project conform with the EPA approved State Implementation Plan?					X
c. The creation of objectionable smoke, ash or odors?					X
d. Extensive dust generation?					X

C Setting:

The project site is located within the Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District and is part of the South Central Coast Air Basin. Air pollutants in the project area are emitted from a mix of ?mobile sources? and ?stationary sources.? Mobile sources are motor vehicles, including cars, trucks, trains, and, construction vehicles. Stationary sources include oil wells, gas flaring facilities, gas burning appliances, fireplaces, evaporation from organic solvents, pesticides, and paints. Windblown dust and soil materials also contribute to air pollution. Common air pollutants include volatile organic compounds (VOC), oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), ozone (O₃), particulate matter, carbon monoxide (CO), oxides of sulfur (SO_x), and toxic air emissions such as lead. Santa Barbara County is classified as being in non-attainment for ozone (state and federal guidelines) and PM₁₀ (federal guidelines).

C Impact Discussion:

The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of a federally owned distribution system to the MWD, which includes all currently existing modifications to the federal system lands and properties. The project does not involve any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure. Therefore, no impacts to air quality will result from the proposed action.

C Mitigation and Residual Impact:

Because there will be no impacts upon air quality, no mitigation measures are necessary, nor will there be any residual impact.

C 4.2 WATER QUALITY/FLOODING:

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
a. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements, in either marine or fresh waters?					X
b. Changes in percolation rates, drainage patterns or the rate and amount of surface water runoff?					X
c. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?					X
d. Discharge into surface waters, or alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, or thermal water pollution (e.g., eutrophication)?					X
e. Alterations to the course or flow of flood waters, or need for private or public flood control projects?					X
f. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding (placement of project in 100 year flood plain), accelerated runoff or tsunamis?					X
g. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of groundwater?					X
h. Change in the quantity of groundwaters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or recharge interference?					X
i. Overdraft or overcommitment of any groundwater basin? Or, a significant increase in the existing overdraft or overcommitment of any groundwater basin?					X
j. The substantial degradation of groundwater quality including saltwater intrusion?					X
k. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?					X
l. Is the project or the project's affected area over a designated sole source aquifer? If so, document consultation with EPA.					X
m. Impacts to water or wastewater treatment facilities?					X
n. Is the project consistent with state and regional water quality standards?					X

C Setting:

The Summerland area is divided into two drainages known as the rural drainage area and the urban drainage area. The rural drainage area is located in the north portion of the community and is naturally drained by the seasonal creek that runs along Greenwell Avenue. Additionally, Torro Creek drains the eastern portion of the rural drainage area. Limited storm drainage infrastructure including the Evans Avenue storm drain and other cross street drains exist within the urban drainage area. Sediment basins have been established in various areas to control erosion and flooding problems within the community. Drainage from the area ultimately enters the Pacific Ocean.

The Communities of Summerland and Montecito obtain water through the MWD. The MWD service area and water supplies are described in Section 3.0, Project Description of this Environmental Assessment.

Wastewater collection and treatment services are provided to the Summerland area by the Summerland Sanitary District. The District's Treatment Plant Capacity is currently 0.3 million gallons per day (mgd) (Custor, personal communication, May 2000).

The project site is within the jurisdiction of the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (CCRWQCB). The CCRWQCB has responsibility over the protection of water quality within the region.

C Impact Discussion:

The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of a federally owned distribution system to the MWD, which includes all currently existing modifications to the federal system lands and properties. The project does not involve any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure. No alterations to water use or wastewater generation would result from the project. The project would not result in any activities that would influence surface or groundwater flow, nor introduce any structures into a flood hazard area. Additionally, there are no elements of the project that would influence water quality.

C Mitigation and Residual Impact:

Because there will be no impacts upon water quality/flooding, no mitigation measures are necessary, nor will there be any residual impact.

C 4.3 PUBLIC FACILITIES/SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT:

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
a. A need for new or altered police protection and/or health care services?					X
b. Student generation exceeding school capacity?					X
c. Significant amounts of solid waste or breach any national, state, or local standards or thresholds relating to solid waste disposal and generation (including recycling facilities and existing landfill capacity)? (List types and quantities of waste to be generated)					X
d. Will there be disposal of hazardous waste?					X
e. A need for new or altered sewer system facilities (sewer lines, lift-stations, etc.)?					X

C Setting:

Public facilities/services and the providers for the Summerland area are listed below.

Public Facilities/Services	C Service Provider
Water Service	Montecito Water District
Wastewater Collection and Treatment	Summerland Sanitary District
Solid Waste Collection and Disposal	E.J Harrison and Sons, Inc. (non-hazardous)
Police Protection	Santa Barbara County Sheriff Department
Fire Protection	Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District
Public Schools	Carpinteria School District

C Impact Discussion:

The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of a federally owned distribution system to the MWD, which includes all currently existing modifications to the federal system lands and properties. The project does not involve any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure that would create a direct or indirect demand for public services. Therefore, no impacts upon public facilities/solid waste management will result.

C Mitigation and Residual Impact:

Because there will be no impacts upon public facilities/solid waste management, no mitigation measures are necessary, nor will there be any residual impact.

C 4.4 LAND USE:

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
a. Structures and/or land use incompatible with existing land use? What effect will there be on existing land uses?					X
b. The induction of substantial growth or concentration of population?					X
c. The extension of sewer trunk lines or access roads with capacity to serve new development beyond this proposed project?					X
d. The conversion of prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use, impairment of agricultural land productivity (whether prime or non-prime), or conflict with agricultural preserve programs?					X
e. An effect upon any unique or other farmland of State or Local Importance?					X
f. The loss of a substantial amount of open space?					X
g. An economic or social effect that would result in a physical change? (i.e., Closure of a freeway ramp results in isolation of an area, businesses located in the vicinity close, neighborhood degenerates, and buildings deteriorate. Or, if construction of new freeway divides an existing community, the construction would be the physical change, but the economic/social effect on the community would be the basis for determining that the physical change would be significant.)					X
h. Conflicts with adopted airport safety zones (including FAA-designated civilian airport Runway Clear Zone, or military airfield Clear Zone or Accident Potential Zone based upon information from the airport administrator designating such zones)?					X
i. Will the project be consistent with land use and zoning regulations?					X
j. Will the project result in the loss, interference, disruption and/or closure of any recreational or open space?					X

C Setting:

Land use and zoning designations within the Summerland area include residential, commercial, agriculture and industrial. An undesignated area also exists within this community.

C Impact Discussion:

The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of a federally owned distribution system to the MWD, which includes all currently existing modifications to the federal system lands and properties. The project does not involve any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure. No changes to existing land uses are proposed. Therefore, the project will not affect land uses and no impacts upon land use will result.

C Mitigation and Residual Impact:

Because there will be no impacts upon land use, no mitigation measures are necessary, nor will there be any residual impact.

C 4.5 TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION:

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
a. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement (daily, peak-hour, etc.) in relation to existing traffic load and capacity of the street system?					X
b. A need for private or public road maintenance, or need for new road(s)?					X
c. Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?					X
d. Substantial impact upon existing transit systems (e.g. bus service) or alteration of present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?					X
e. Alteration to waterborne, rail or air traffic?					X
f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians (including short-term construction and long-term operational)?					X
g. Inadequate sight distance?					X
ingress/egress?					X
general road capacity?					X
emergency access?					X

C Setting:

The primary method of transportation within the project area is by automobile. Surface streets are widely distributed throughout the Summerland area. A major highway, U.S. 101 serves the area as does the Union Pacific Railroad.

C Impact Discussion:

The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of a federally owned distribution system to the MWD, which includes all currently existing modifications to the federal system lands and properties. The project does not involve any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure that would generate additional traffic or otherwise influence transportation systems. Therefore, no impacts upon transportation/circulation will result.

C Mitigation and Residual Impact:

Because there will be no impacts upon transportation/circulation, no mitigation measures are necessary, nor will there be any residual impact.

C 4.6 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT:

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
a. A loss or disturbance to a unique, rare or threatened plant community?					X
b. A reduction in the numbers or restriction in the range of any unique, rare or threatened species of plants?					X

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
c. A reduction in the extent, diversity, or quality of native vegetation (including brush removal for fire prevention and flood control improvements)?					X
d. An impact on non-native vegetation whether naturalized or horticultural if of habitat value?					X
e. The loss of healthy native specimen trees?					X
f. Introduction of herbicides, pesticides, animal life, human habitation, non-native plants, or other factors that would change or hamper the existing habitat?					X
g. A reduction in the numbers, a restriction in the range, or an impact to the critical habitat of any unique, rare, threatened, or endangered species of animals?					X
h. A reduction in the diversity or numbers of animals onsite (including mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, fish or invertebrates)?					X
i. A deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat (for foraging, breeding, roosting, nesting, etc.)?					X
j. Introduction of barriers to movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species?					X
k. Introduction of any factors (light, fencing, noise, human presence and/or domestic animals) which could hinder the normal activities of wildlife?					X

C Setting:

The project area consists of many diverse natural habitats and supports an abundance of flora and fauna. Various biological communities within the area include woodlands (oak, eucalyptus and cypress), riparian habitats and coastal sage scrub. Environmentally sensitive habitats within the area include wetlands (streams), butterfly trees, oak woodlands and coastal sage scrub. The Summerland Community Plan indicates that three sensitive plant species have been identified in the Summerland area. The identified species are: Plummer's *Baccharis* (*Baccharis plumerae*), Chaparral Mallow (*Malacothamnus fasciculatus var. nuttallii*) and White-Flowered Sticky Phacelia (*Phacelia viscida var. albiflora*). These species are presently not listed with State or Federal species protection agencies. However, they are considered sensitive by either the California Native Plants Society or the County of Santa Barbara. A records search of the Natural Diversity Data Base was conducted for the Carpinteria Quadrangle (see appendix). Based upon the available records no listed species have been recorded as being located within the project area. However, this does not necessarily mean that none occur.

C Impact Discussion:

The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of a federally owned distribution system to the MWD, which includes all currently existing modifications to the federal system lands and properties. The project does not involve any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure that would affect either plants, animals, or their habitat. Therefore, no impacts upon the natural environment will result.

C Mitigation and Residual Impact:

Because there will be no impacts upon the natural environment, no mitigation measures are necessary, nor will there be any residual impact.

C 4.7 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AND HUMAN POPULATION:

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
a. A direct or indirect effect on low income or minority residents? (Note: attach Form RECD 2006-38 "Civil Rights Impact Analysis Certification")					X
b. An effect on a neighborhood that suffers from adverse human health or environmental conditions?					X
c. An effect on nearby or adjacent neighborhoods that are predominantly low income or minority?					X
d. A beneficial effect by employing or serving a clientele of predominantly low income or minority persons at the project site?					X
e. A relocation of persons?					X
f. An impact on nearby residents or changes in demographics?					X

C Setting:

The Summerland community is located within unincorporated Santa Barbara County. In May of 1992 the County adopted a Community Plan for Summerland. At the time of its preparation, the area had 84,413 s.f. of commercial space with potential for buildout of up to an additional 72,080 s.f., 54,600 s.f. of industrial space with buildout potential for an additional 55,000 s.f., and 550 residential units with the potential for an additional 267 units.

C Impact Discussion:

The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of a federally owned distribution system to the MWD, which includes all currently existing modifications to the federal system lands and properties. The project does not involve any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure that would affect neighborhoods or individual residents. Therefore, no impacts regarding environmental justice and human population will occur.

C Mitigation and Residual Impact:

Because there will be no impacts upon environmental justice and human population, no mitigation measures are necessary, nor will there be any residual impact.

C **4.8 CONSTRUCTION:**

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
a. Construction impacts on air quality, water quality, noise levels, solid waste disposal soil erosion and siltation?					X

C **Setting:**

A construction setting is not applicable to the proposed project.

C **Impact Discussion:**

The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of a federally owned distribution system to the MWD, which includes all currently existing modifications to the federal system lands and properties. The project does not involve any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure or other construction. Therefore, no impacts upon air quality, water quality, noise levels, solid waste disposal, soil erosion, or siltation resulting from construction will result.

C **Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

Because there will be no impacts on air quality, water quality, noise levels, solid waste disposal, soil erosion, or siltation resulting from construction, no mitigation measures are necessary, nor will there be any residual impact.

C **4.9 ENERGY IMPACTS:**

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
a. Substantial increase in demand, especially during peak periods, upon existing sources of energy?					X
b. Requirement for the development or extension of new sources of energy?					X
c. The use of energy conservation measures?					X

C **Setting:**

An energy setting is not applicable to the proposed project.

C Impact Discussion:

The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of a federally owned distribution system to the MWD, which includes all currently existing modifications to the federal system lands and properties. The project does not involve any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure that could increase demand upon existing sources of energy. The project will not require the development or extension of new sources of energy or the use of energy conservation measures. Therefore, no impacts upon energy will result.

C Mitigation and Residual Impact:

Because there will be no impacts on energy use or demand, no mitigation measures are necessary, nor will there be any residual impact.

C 4.10 NOISE ABATEMENT AND CONTROL:

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
a. Long-term exposure of people to noise levels exceeding thresholds (e.g. locating noise sensitive uses within the line of site. of an arterial roadway or railroad or an airport that would have an ambient noise level of greater than 65 LDN based on the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Noise Assessment Guide (NAG)?					X
b. Short-term exposure of people to noise levels exceeding thresholds?					X
c. Project-generated substantial increase in the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas (either day or night)?					X

C Setting:

Noise is generally defined as unwanted or objectionable sound. The dominant noise sources heard in the project area are traffic along U.S. 101 and other major surface streets, railroad traffic, commercial and industrial operations, residential activity, birds, surf, wind, and occasional air traffic. Land uses that are especially sensitive to noise include residences, schools, libraries, day-care, parks, hotels, hospitals, and rest homes.

C Impact Discussion:

The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of a federally owned distribution system to the MWD, which includes all currently existing modifications to the federal system lands and properties. The project does not involve any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure. No activities that would generate noise, nor introduction of noise sensitive uses into noisy environments would result. Therefore, no impacts upon noise abatement and control will result.

C Mitigation and Residual Impact:

Because there will be no impacts on noise abatement and control, no mitigation measures are necessary, nor will there be any residual impact.

C 4.11 EXPLOSIVE FLAMMABLE OPERATIONS:

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
a. The exposure of people or buildings to any above-ground explosive or flammable fuels, or chemicals containers? (If necessary mitigate the hazard per 24 CFR 51.205) with the construction of a barrier with adequate size and strength to protect the project from the explosive or flammable hazard.					X

C Setting:

There are operations in the project area, which use, transport, store or dispose of explosive or flammable materials. These include the railroad which transports hazardous materials, a Southern California Gas transmission line and a local gas station. However, the presence of these facilities and their operations do not pertain to the proposed project.

C Impact Discussion:

The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of a federally owned distribution system to the MWD, which includes all currently existing modifications to the federal system lands and properties. The project does not involve any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure, and will not expose people or buildings to any explosive or flammable fuels or chemicals. Therefore, no impacts associated with their use or presence will result.

C Mitigation and Residual Impact:

Because there will be no impacts resulting from explosive or flammable fuel or chemicals, no mitigation measures are necessary, nor will there be any residual impact.

C 4.12 TOXIC, CHEMICAL, AND RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS:

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
a. New development for habitation within one mile of a National Priority List (NPL Superfund) site; or within 2,000 feet of a CERCLIS site; or adjacent to any other known or suspected sites contaminate with toxic, radioactive, or hazardous materials (unless a federal, state or local authoritative source determines the site does not pose a health hazard)?					X
b. In the known history of this property, have there been any past uses, storage, or discharge of hazardous materials? Examples of hazardous materials include, but are not limited to, fuel or oil stored in underground tanks, pesticides, solvents, or other chemicals? (If the project involves property acquisition, include the results of a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment)					X
c. Will the proposed project involve the use, storage, or distribution of hazardous or toxic materials?					X
d. A risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to oil, gas, biocides, bacteria, pesticides, chemicals or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions?					X
e. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?					X
f. The creation of a potential public health hazard?					X
g. Public safety hazards (e.g., due to development near existing chemical or industrial activity, producing oil wells, toxic disposal sites, etc.)?					X
h. Exposure to hazards from oil or gas pipelines or oil well facilities?					X
i. The contamination of a public water supply?					X

C Setting:

Significant sources of radioactive materials are absent from the project area (e.g., nuclear power, weapons stations, etc.). There are operations in the project area, which use, store and or transport toxic or chemical materials as described above.

C Impact Discussion:

The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of a federally owned distribution system to the MWD, which includes all currently existing modifications to the federal system lands and properties. The project does not involve any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure. No uses of hazardous materials are proposed nor would the project expose people to existing toxic, chemical, or radioactive material. Therefore, no impacts resulting from toxic, chemical, or radioactive materials will occur.

C Mitigation and Residual Impact:

Because there will be no impacts related to toxic, chemical, or radioactive materials, no mitigation measures are necessary, nor will there be any residual impact.

C 4.13 GEOLOGIC PROCESSES:

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
a. Exposure to or production of unstable earth conditions such as landslides, earthquakes, liquefaction, soil creep, mudslides, ground failure (including expansive, compressible, collapsible soils), or similar hazards?					X
b. Disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcovering of the soil by cuts, fills, or extensive grading?					X
c. Permanent changes in topography?					X
d. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic, paleontologic, or physical features?					X
e. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?					X
f. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sands or dunes, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel of a river, or stream, or the bed of the ocean, or any bay, inlet or lake?					X
g. The placement of septic disposal systems in impermeable soils with severe constraints to disposal of liquid effluent?					X
h. Extraction of mineral or ore?					X
i. Excessive grading on slopes of over 20%?					X
j. Sand or gravel removal or loss of topsoil?					X
k. Vibrations, from short-term construction or long-term operation, which may affect adjoining areas?					X

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
I. Excessive spoils, tailings or over-burden?					X

C **Setting:**

Summerland is located in the foothills of the Santa Ynez Mountains, near the western edge of the Transverse Ranges. The Rincon Formation which consists of silty claystone and clayey siltstone underlies the Summerland area. The formation exhibits gently rolling topography with many landslide and creep features. In the southern portion of the community, the Rincon formation is overlain by the Casitas Formation, terrace deposits, colluvium (e.g., materials eroded from immediately upland areas) and landslide debris. Summerland, like all of southern California is seismically active.

C **Impact Discussion:**

The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of a federally owned distribution system to the MWD, which includes all currently existing modifications to the federal system lands and properties. The project does not involve any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure. No activities that would alter earth conditions are proposed. Therefore, no impacts upon or resulting from geologic processes will occur.

C **Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

Because the proposed project will not be subject to any impacts resulting from geologic hazards, no mitigation measures are necessary, nor will there be any residual impact.

C **4.14 CULTURAL RESOURCES - ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES:**

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
a. Disruption, alteration, destruction, or adverse effect on a recorded prehistoric or historic archaeological site?					X
b. Disruption or removal of human remains?					X
c. Increased potential for trespassing, vandalizing, or sabotaging archaeological resources?					X
d. Ground disturbances in an area with potential cultural resource sensitivity based on the location of known historic or prehistoric sites?					X
e. Adverse effect as defined by the Advisory Council on					X

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
Historic Preservation regulations (36 CFR Part 800, Section 800.9 (b)) on historic properties on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (as defined by 36 CFR Section 60.4)?					
f. Adverse physical or aesthetic impacts on a structure or property at least 50 years old and/or of historic or cultural significance to the community, state or nation other than those on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places?					X
g. Beneficial impacts to an historic resource by providing rehabilitation, protection in a conservation/open easement, etc.?					X

C Setting:

The project area lies within the historic territory of the Native American group known as the Chumash. The Chumash occupied the region from San Luis Obispo to Malibu Canyon on the coast, inland as far as the western edge of the San Joaquin Valley, and the four northern Channel Islands. The Chumash are subdivided into factions based on six distinct dialects: Barbareño, Ventureño, Purisimeño, Ynezeño, Obispeño, and Island.

Although a complete systematic survey of historical structures in the Summerland area has not been done, numerous structures apparently exceed 50 years of age and are therefore considered important from a historical standpoint (County of Santa Barbara, May 1992). No County Historical Landmarks are recorded in Summerland.

A record search for archaeological sites, historic properties and previous cultural resources studies conducted by the Central Coast Information Center (California Archaeological Inventory) in May 2000 identified 14 recorded archaeological resource sites and no historic properties within MWD's boundaries. A total of 27 cultural resources studies are documented to have been conducted within the Summerland area of the District's service area. The recorded sites are mostly concentrated outside of the developed community center.

The National Historic Preservation Act requires that the heads of all Federal agencies shall assume responsibility for the preservation of historic properties which are owned or controlled by their agency. Historic properties are considered to include all properties listed in the National Register and to properties meeting eligibility criteria specified in 36 CFR Section 60.4¹. Because

¹ Department of the Interior regulations describe the National Register criteria for listing in 36 CFR Section 60.4 as follows. The quality of significance in American History, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and

the transfer of federally-owned historic properties to a non-federal entity is considered an adverse effect, it is important to acknowledge the presence of such historic properties on federally-owned lands. The Central Coast Information Center records search mapped results were compared to the distribution system map. Based upon this comparison, no known historic properties are present on the lands owned or controlled by the Bureau of Reclamation. At least one historic property is present on easement lands (in the southern portion of the system). The historic property present on easement lands may be on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. However, the Bureau's easements possess only the right of use of the land and that right of use extends only to the extent necessary to provide the actual benefit intended by the easement. The lands underlying the Bureau's MWD distribution system easements are not under the direct or indirect jurisdiction of the Bureau and are not under the Bureau's ownership or control.

The MWD distribution system does not meet any of the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (criterion A, B, C, or D). Additionally, the system is less than 50 years old.

C Impact Discussion:

The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of a federally owned distribution system to the MWD, which includes all currently existing modifications to the federal system lands and properties. The project does not involve any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure that could alter, disrupt, disturb, or destroy any archaeological or historic resources that may be present within the MWD's service area.

As indicated above, the distribution system does not include any federally-owned lands with identified historic resources. Therefore, no transfer of federally-owned historic properties to a non-federal agency would occur and no adverse effects to historic resources would result.

C Mitigation and Residual Impact:

Because the proposed project will have no impact on archaeological or historic resources, no mitigation measures are necessary, nor will there be any residual impact.

objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and that a) are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or b) that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or c) that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or d) that have yielded or may be likely to yield information important in history or prehistory.

C 4.15 ETHNIC RESOURCES:

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
a. Disruption of or adverse effects upon a prehistoric or historic archaeological site or property of historic or cultural significance to a community or ethnic group?					X
b. Increased potential for trespassing, vandalizing, or sabotaging ethnic, sacred, or ceremonial places?					X
c. The potential to conflict with or restrict existing religious, sacred, or educational uses of the area?					X

Setting:

The Summerland has been inhabited by different ethnic groups over time. See also the setting discussion provided in 4.14 above.

C Impact Discussion:

The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of a federally owned distribution system to the MWD, which includes all currently existing modifications to the federal system lands and properties. The project does not involve any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure that would have the potential to adversely affect ethnic resources or activities. Therefore, no impacts upon ethnic resources will occur.

C Mitigation and Residual Impact:

Because the proposed project will have no impact on archaeological, cultural, or ethnic resources, no mitigation measures are necessary, nor will there be any residual impact.

C 4.16 FIRE PROTECTION:

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
a. Introduction of development into an existing high fire hazard area?					X
b. Project-caused high fire hazard?					X
c. Introduction of development into an area without adequate water pressure, fire hydrants or adequate access for fire fighting?					X
d. Introduction of development that will hamper fire					X

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
prevention techniques such as controlled burns or backfiring in high fire hazard areas?					
e. Development of structures beyond safe Fire Dept. response time?					X

C Setting:

Fire protection services to the coastal areas between the Ventura County/Santa Barbara County line to the east and Montecito to the west are provided by the Carpinteria/Summerland Fire Protection District, hereafter referred to as the "Fire District". The Fire District is supported by local taxes, and serves a population of more than 18,000 people.

The Fire District has entered into mutual aid agreements with the Ventura County Fire Department, Santa Barbara County Fire Department, and Montecito Fire Protection District. Under the mutual aid agreement, the fire departments assist each other as needed. Mobile Life Services, a private medical company, operates within the Fire District's Carpinteria Station, and provides paramedic and "life essential" services within the Fire District boundaries.

The Fire District operates two fire stations. Station 1 is located at 911 Walnut Avenue in the downtown area of Carpinteria. Station 2 is located at 2375 Lilly Avenue in Summerland. The Fire District is currently staffed by 28 full-time fire fighters. At a minimum, Stations 1 and 2 are staffed with one duty chief, two engine companies (three fire fighters per engine company), and a fire inspector. The Fire District currently provides adequate fire protection throughout its service area.

C Impact Discussion:

The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of a federally owned distribution system to the MWD, which includes all currently existing modifications to the federal system lands and properties. The project does not involve any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure, or any other development that could increase demand for fire protection services, create a fire hazard, or interfere with fire protection response. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on fire protection.

C Mitigation and Residual Impact:

Because the proposed project will have no impact on fire protection, no mitigation measures are necessary, nor will there be any residual impact.

C 4.17 RECREATION:

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
a. Conflict with established recreational uses of the area?					X
b. Conflict with biking, equestrian, and hiking trails?					X
c. Substantial impact on the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities (e.g., over use of an area with constraints on numbers of people, vehicles, animals, etc. which might safely use the area)?					X

C Setting:

The Summerland Community is well served by parks and trails. The system includes the following:

Lookout Beach Park,

Loon Point Beach,

Greenwell Avenue Park,

Wallace Avenue Beach, and

1.54 miles and 1.67 miles of offroad and onroad trails respectively.

C Impact Discussion:

The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of a federally owned distribution system to the MWD, which includes all currently existing modifications to the federal system lands and properties. The project does not involve any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure, and will not conflict with any recreational uses of the area, or impact the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities. Therefore, no impacts on recreation will result.

C Mitigation and Residual Impact:

Because the proposed project will result in no impact on recreation, no mitigation measures are necessary, nor will there be any residual impact.

C 4.18 AESTHETIC/VISUAL RESOURCES:

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
a. The obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public or the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?					X
b. Change to the visual character of an area?					X
c. Glare or night lighting which may affect adjoining areas?					X
d. Visually incompatible structures?					X

C Setting:

The Summerland community is situated on a narrow shelf located between the Pacific Ocean and the Santa Ynez Mountains which rise steeply and dramatically. Visual resources of the community include natural land and water forms (streams, ocean and unusual geographic phenomena) as well as unique buildings. The primary view corridor through the community is U.S. Highway 101.

C Impact Discussion:

The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of a federally owned distribution system to the MWD, which includes all currently existing modifications to the federal system lands and properties. The project does not involve any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure, and will not obstruct or change any aesthetic or visual resources in the area. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on aesthetic or visual resources.

C Mitigation and Residual Impact:

Because the proposed project will result in no impact on aesthetic or visual resources, no mitigation measures are necessary, nor will there be any residual impact.

C 4.19 HOUSING:

Will the proposal result in:	Known Signif.	Unknown Poten. Signif.	Poten. Signif. and Mitig.	Not Signif.	No Impact
a. Loss of existing affordable dwellings through demolition, conversion, or removal?					X
b. Displacement of current residents?					X

C Setting:

The community of Summerland had 550 units of housing with development potential for an additional 267 units at the time of the preparation of the Summerland Community Plan (County of Santa Barbara, May 1992). The community had the potential for buildout of an additional 267 units.

C Impact Discussion:

The proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of a federally owned distribution system to the MWD, which includes all currently existing modifications to the federal system lands and properties. The project does not involve any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure, and will not displace any current residents or cause the loss of affordable dwellings through demolition, conversion, or removal. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on housing.

C Mitigation and Residual Impact:

Because the proposed project will have no impact on housing, no mitigation measures are necessary, nor will there be any residual impact.

C 5.0

INFORMATION SOURCES

C 5.1 AGENCIES AND INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED

The following agencies and individuals supplied information to the preparers for this Environmental Assessment.

VI. Fred Adjarian, General Manager, Montecito Water District

VII. Art Custor, Summerland Sanitary District

VIII. Evalyn Kerman, Montecito Water District

C 5.2 BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (October 1986), *Section 106, Step-by-Step*.

Bureau of Reclamation (1997), *Environmental Assessment, Temporary Deviation from Flood Control Regulations, Friant Dam and Millerton Lake, Friant Division, Central Valley Project*.

California Archaeological Inventory Information Center, May 24, 2000 Letter, Record Search Results.

County of Santa Barbara (May 1992), *Final Summerland Community Plan*.

C **5.3 OTHER SOURCES (CHECK THOSE SOURCES USED):**

<input type="checkbox"/> Field work	<input type="checkbox"/> Ag Preserve maps
<input type="checkbox"/> Calculations	<input type="checkbox"/> Flood Control maps
<input type="checkbox"/> Project plans	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other technical references
<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic studies	(reports, survey, etc.)
<input type="checkbox"/> Records	<input type="checkbox"/> Planning files, maps, reports
<input type="checkbox"/> Grading plans	<input type="checkbox"/> Zoning maps
<input type="checkbox"/> Elevation, architectural renderings	<input type="checkbox"/> Soils maps/reports
<input type="checkbox"/> Published geological map/reports	<input type="checkbox"/> Plant maps
<input type="checkbox"/> Topographical maps	<input type="checkbox"/> Archaeological maps and reports
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
	http://www.montecitowater.com/genera.htm

C **6.0 PROJECT SPECIFIC (SHORT AND LONG TERM), AND CUMULATIVE IMPACT SUMMARY**

C **Significant Unavoidable Impacts**

There will be no unavoidable project-specific or cumulative impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed project.

C **Significant Impacts that can be Mitigated to a Less Than Significant Level**

There will be no project-specific or cumulative impacts resulting from the implementation of this project. Therefore, there are no significant impacts that need to be mitigated.

C **7.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

There are two alternatives that have presently been evaluated. These are the No Action Alternative and partial ownership transfer of the water distribution system to the MWD.

C **7.1 NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

The No Action Alternative would be to operate and maintain the water distribution system as at present. The Bureau would retain ownership of the distribution system and the District would operate and maintain the distribution system. This alternative would call for continued communication and consultation between the Bureau and the MWD regarding the operation and maintenance of the water distribution system. Because no environmental impacts would be associated with this project, this alternative could not be environmentally superior to the proposed action. This alternative contradicts the purpose of the project to simplify and reduce paperwork and coordination associated with the operation and maintenance of the water distribution system and has been omitted from further discussion.

C 7.2 PARTIAL OWNERSHIP TRANSFER

The partial ownership transfer alternative would allow the transfer of ownership of some portion of the water distribution system to the District. The Bureau would still own the remainder of the system. This alternative would not significantly reduce communication and consultation between the Bureau and District, and could even increase bureaucracy between the two agencies. Because no environmental impacts would be associated with this project, this alternative could not be environmentally superior to the proposed action. However, this alternative also contradicts the purpose of the project. Additionally, the title can not be divided (Young, personal communication, June 2000). Therefore, this alternative has been dropped from further consideration.

C 8.0 COMPLIANCE WITH THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT

The purpose of this act is to protect, preserve, rehabilitate or restore significant historical and archaeological data, objects, or structures. Cultural resources is a broad term that includes prehistoric, historic, architectural, and traditional cultural properties. Such resources are listed, or are eligible to be listed, in the national Register of Historic Places. The State Historic Preservation Office maintains a database of significant properties in California.

The Bureau will communicate with the State Historic Preservation Office with regard to the project's compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act. The proposed action represents only a change in ownership of the service distribution system and therefore, there is no potential to change the character or use of any historic or cultural resources in the area.

C 9.0 COMPLIANCE WITH THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

The general purpose of this statute is to conserve and protect threatened and endangered species of fish, wildlife, and plants. Section 7 of the Act requires:

1. federal agencies to utilize their authorities to conduct programs to conserve endangered and threatened species;
2. consultation with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service when a federal action may affect a listed species to ensure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by a federal agency is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat;
3. conference with the Service when a federal action is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat.

The California Department of Fish and Game Natural Diversity Data Base was queried to determine the presence of sensitive, threatened and endangered species within the MWD service area. The results of the survey are provided as an attachment to this EA.

Because the proposed project is only a transfer of ownership of an existing service distribution system, the project is not anticipated to have an effect on sensitive, threatened or endangered species. The Bureau will consult with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish & Game with regard to the project's compliance with the Endangered Species Act.

3. 10.0 COMPLIANCE WITH THE FISH AND WILDLIFE COORDINATION ACT

This act requires federal agencies to consult with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (Service) and the California Department of Fish & Game before undertaking projects or actions that control or modify surface water. This consultation is intended to promote the conservation of wildlife resources by preventing loss of or damage to fish and wildlife resources and to provide for the development and improvement of fish and wildlife resources in connection with water projects. The Service and CDFG are authorized to conduct necessary surveys and investigations, to determine the possible damage to resources and to determine measures for preventing such losses. The reports and recommendations of the Service and CDFG may be integrated into any report that grants permission or authority to construct a project or modify or supplement plans for previously authorized projects.

The Bureau will consult with the Service and CDFG for compliance with this act. Because the proposed project is only a transfer of ownership and does not include any physical modifications or expansions, the project is not anticipated to have an effect on fish and wildlife resources.

3. 11.0 COMPLIANCE WITH THE INDIAN TRUST ASSETS

Indian Trust Assets are legal interests in property or rights held in trust by the U.S. for Indian Tribes or individual Native Americans. Trust status originates from rights imparted by treaties, statutes, or executive orders. Such assets cannot be sold, leased, or otherwise alienated without federal approval.

Indian reservations, rancherias, and allotments are common Indian Trust Assets. Allotments are parcels of land held in trust for specific individuals that may be located outside reservation boundaries. In addition, such assets include the right to access certain traditional areas and perform traditional ceremonies.

3. 12.0 COMPLIANCE WITH THE STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

The proposed project qualifies for an exemption under CEQA, pursuant to Section 15062 of the CEQA Guidelines. A Notice of Exemption has been prepared and is on file at the MWD office located at 583 San Ysidro Road, Montecito, CA 93108. The Notice will also be filed with the County Clerk of Santa Barbara. The proposed project is also Categorical Exempt under Section 15301, Existing Facilities.

3. 13.0 MITIGATION MEASURES

The proposed project will not result in any impacts. Therefore, no mitigation measures are necessary.

3. 14.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

Donna M. Hebert, Project Manager, Padre Associates, Inc.

Suzun Rasmusson, Graphics Specialist, Padre Associates, Inc.

David Young, Environmental Specialist, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation

Jim West, Cultural Resources Specialist, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation

Sheryl Carter, Contract Repayment Specialist, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation